

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Stoney Hugo Glenn, #993648,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 0:09-712-TLW-PJG
	)	
Lexington County Jail;	)	
Sheriff James Metts;	)	
Sgt Taylor;	)	
West Columbia Police Department,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Stoney Hugo Glenn (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC.

On May 21, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued an initial Report and Recommendation recommending that the District Court dismiss defendants Lexington County Jail and West Columbia Police Department. (Doc. #14). This Report and Recommendation remains pending. While the Report and Recommendation was pending, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41. (Doc. #26). This matter now comes before this Court for review of the second Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge on August 24, 2009. (Doc. #39). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. (Doc. #39). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on September 11, 2009. In addition, the docket reflects that numerous documents that have been sent to the plaintiff by the Clerk of Court

have been returned to the Clerk of Court as undeliverable. Thus, the plaintiff has failed to keep the Court apprised of his current address. Without a proper address for the plaintiff, the parties are unable to litigate the plaintiff's claims for relief.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #39). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this action is, hereby, **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

In light of this ruling accepting the Magistrate Judge's August 24, 2009 report, the Magistrate Judge's initial Report and Recommendation, (Doc. #14), is now moot. All additional pending motions in this case are dismissed as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

October 5, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina